UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,594	12/05/2005	**Menny Sherman**	P-7258-US	9148

49443 7590 11/24/2008

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway
12th Floor
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER	
TIEU, BINH KIEN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2614	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
11/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/559,594	SHERMAN, MENNY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BINH K. TIEU	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 August 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pomp et al. (US. Pat. #: 5,859,895).

Regarding claim 7, Pomp et al. ("Pomp") teaches a method comprising:

automatically and sequentially performing an impairment line testing on a plurality of telephone lines (i.e., cable 19, as shown in figure 1, having active lines and spare line), wherein, at least a portion of said telephone lines are active telephone lines and at least one of said telephone lines is a spare line, and performing the impairment line testing on the active lines is done without disconnecting said active telephone lines from their respective telephone line cards (see col.13, lines 47-49 and col.15, lines 21-67).

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bellows (US. Pat. #: 5,937,033).

Regarding claim 7, Bellows teaches a method comprising:

automatically and sequentially performing an impairment line testing on a plurality of telephone lines (i.e., drops 16, as shown in figure 1, having active lines and spare line; see col.1, lines 52-66), wherein, at least a portion of said telephone lines are active telephone lines and at least one of said telephone lines is a spare line, and performing the impairment line testing on the active lines is done without disconnecting said active telephone lines from their respective telephone line cards (see col.4, line 34 – col.5, line 13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 8, 11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pomp et al. (US. Pat. #: 5,859,895) or Bellows (US. Pat. #: 5,937,033) in view of Faulkner et al. (US. Pat. #: US 6,385,297, ***cited in the previous Office Action***).

Regarding claim 8, Pomp or Bellows, each teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for the feature of determining the distance between the location of a measurement device coupled to one of said telephone line and the location of the termination of said telephone line at its respective subscriber premises. However, Faulkner et al. ("Faulkner") teaches such feature in col.7, lines 2-3 for a purpose of determining of quality of signal transmitted in that distance.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of determining the distance between the location of a measurement device coupled to one of said telephone line and the location of the termination of said telephone line at its respective subscriber premises, as taught by Faulkner, into view of Pomp or Bellows in order to determine of quality of signal transmitted in that distance.

Regarding claim 11, Faulkner further teaches limitations of the claim in figure 2, note col.8, line 63 through col.9, line 64.

Regarding claim 13, Faulkner further teaches limitations of the claim as one terminal of the voltage source 30, as shown in figure 2, being connected to a common ground (col.8, lines 63-64).

Regarding claim 14, Faulkner further teaches limitations of the claim in col.12, lines 6-15.

Regarding claim 15, the same procedure for testing the active telephone lines as discussed above to be obviously applied in a manner for testing a spare telephone line.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pomp et al. (US. Pat. #: 5,859,895) or Bellows (US. Pat. #: 5,937,033) in view of Schneider (US. Pat. #: 6,215,855, ***also cited in the previous Office Action***).

Regarding claim 9, Pomp or Bellows, each teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for the feature of connecting the measurement device to the twisted wire pair through a main distribution frame. However, Schneider teaches a system and a method for measuring and certifying a subscriber telephone loop for xDSL services as shown in figure 3. Schneider further teaches that a central office test device, such as Test (CO) 165 is connected to subscriber via the MDF 101 (see col.12, lines 44-57) for a purpose of testing and certifying a subscriber telephone line for xDSL services.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of connecting the measurement device to the twisted wire pair through a main distribution frame, as taught by Schneider, into view of Pomp or Bellows in order to test and certify a subscriber telephone line for xDSL services.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pomp et al. (US. Pat. #: 5,859,895) or Bellows (US. Pat. #: 5,937,033) in view of Posthuma (US. Pat. #: 6,456,694, ***also cited in the previous Office Action***).

Regarding claim 10, Pomp or Bellows, each teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for the feature of performing said line testing on one of said active lines when said active line is carrying telephone signals. However, Posthuma '694 teaches such features in col.5, lines 38-58 for a purpose of determining the high speed service capabilities of the line.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of performing said line testing on one of said active lines when said active line is carrying telephone signals, as taught by Posthuma '694, into view of Pomp or Bellows in order to determine the high speed service capabilities of the line.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pomp et al. (US. Pat. #: 5,859,895) or Bellows (US. Pat. #: 5,937,033 in view of Charland (US. Pat. #: 5,550,894, ***also cited in the previous Office Action***).

Regarding claims 2 and 12, Pomp or Bellows, each teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for the feature of electrically connecting said terminal of a measurement unit comprising short-circuiting between said devices. However, Charland teaches a measurement device as shown figure 2 comprising a plurality of switches wherein a switch 42 is configured as a short switch connected across the tip

and ring conductor of the telephone (see col.9, lines 35-36) for a purpose of testing the subscriber line for a short circuit.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of electrically connecting said terminal of a measurement unit comprising short-circuiting between said device, as taught by Charland, into view of Pomp or Bellows in order to testing the subscriber line for a short circuit.

9. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faulkner et al. (US. Pat. #: US 6,385,297) in view of Posthuma (US. Pat. #: 6,496,566) (***Both references were cited in the previous Office Action***).

Regarding claim 1, Faulkner et al. (Hereinafter, "Faulkner") teaches a method comprising:

electrically connecting a first terminal of a measurement device to both wires of a twisted wire pair of a telephone line, (i.e., in figure 2, voltage source 30 of measurement unit 18 comprises two terminals, one of them connected to the pair of wires T and R through resistors R1 and R1, col.8, lines 65-66);

electrically connecting a second terminal of said measurement device to a common reference (i.e., the other terminal of the voltage source of the measurement unit 18 is connected to ground potential, see col.8, lines 63-64); and

performing an impairment line testing on said telephone line from said measurement device toward said subscriber (col.8, line 67 through col.9, line 64).

It should be noticed that Faulkner fails to clearly teach the feature of said telephone line which interconnects a telephone card with a subscriber. However, Posthuma teaches such feature in figure 1, note col.1, lines 38-51 for a purpose of testing of a subscriber loop for both voice and DSL services.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of said telephone line which interconnects a telephone card with a subscriber, as taught by Posthuma, into view of Faulkner in order to provide telecommunication services such as routing both data and voice services to subscriber.

Regarding claim 3, Faulkner further teaches one terminal of the voltage source 30, as shown in figure 2, being connected to a common ground (col.8, lines 63-64).

Regarding claim 4, Faulkner further teaches limitations of the claim in col.12, lines 6-15.

Regarding claim 5, Faulkner further teaches limitations of the claim in col.7, lines 2-3.

10. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faulkner et al. (US. Pat. #: US 6,385,297) in view of Posthuma (US. Pat. #: 6,496,566) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Charland (US. Pat. #: 5,550,894 ***also cited in the previous Office Action***).

Regarding claim 2, Faulkner and Posthuma, in combination, teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for the feature of electrically connecting said terminal

of a measurement unit comprising short-circuiting between said devices. However, Charland teaches a measurement device as shown figure 2 comprising a plurality of switches wherein a switch 42 is configured as a short switch connected across the tip and ring conductor of the telephone (see col.9, lines 35-36) for a purpose of testing the subscriber line for a short circuit.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of electrically connecting said terminal of a measurement unit comprising short-circuiting between said device, as taught by Charland, into view of Faulkner and Posthuma in order to testing the subscriber line for a short circuit.

11. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faulkner et al. (US. Pat. #: US 6,385,297) in view of Posthuma (US. Pat. #: 6,496,566) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schneider (US. Pat. #: 6,215,855 ***also cited in the previous Office Action***).

Regarding claim 6, Faulkner and Posthuma, in combination, teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for the feature of connecting the measurement device to the twisted wire pair through a main distribution frame. However, Schneider teaches a system and a method for measuring and certifying a subscriber telephone loop for xDSL services as shown in figure 3. Schneider further teaches that a central office test device, such as Test (CO) 165 is connected to subscriber via the MDF 101 (see col.12,

lines 44-57) for a purpose of testing and certifying a subscriber telephone line for xDSL services.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of connecting the measurement device to the twisted wire pair through a main distribution frame, as taught by Schneider, into view of Faulkner and Posthuma in order to test and certify a subscriber telephone line for xDSL services.

12. Claims 16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faulkner et al. (US. Pat. #: US 6,385,297) in view of Posthuma (US. Pat. #: 6,456,694 ***also cited in the previous Office Action***).

Regarding claim 16, Faulkner teaches a test control system comprising measurement units 18 connecting to switch 12, as shown in figure 1. The measurement units 18 are adapted to test subscriber twisted pairs connected to the switch 12 either on demand, or automatically, from a preprogrammed list of lines. Each of the measurement units 18 has access to every subscriber through the switch 12. The unit 18 gains access to test a subscribers loop through a switched test bus. Thus the switched test bus read on a line selector unit connectable to the twisted wire pairs of telephone lines able to select one of said wire pairs for an impairment line testing (see col.6, lines 6-24). Faulkner further teaches in figure 2 the configuration of the measurement units 18 comprising a voltage source 30 of measurement unit 18 having two terminals, one of them connected to the pair of wires T and R through resistors R1

and R1, col.8, lines 65-66); and the other terminal of the voltage source of the measurement unit 18 is connected to ground potential, see col.8, lines 63-64).

It should be noticed that Faulkner fails to clearly teach a line status detector to identify the status of said telephone lines and as an active telephone line. However, Posthuma '694 teaches such features in col.5, lines 38-58 for a purpose of determining the high speed service capabilities of the line.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of performing said line testing on one of said active lines when said active line is carrying telephone signals, as taught by Posthuma '694, into view of Faulkner and Posthuma '566 in order to determine the high speed service capabilities of the line.

Regarding claim 18, Faulkner further teaches one terminal of the voltage source 30, as shown in figure 2, being connected to a common ground (col.8, lines 63-64).

Regarding claim 19, Faulkner further teaches limitations of the claim in col.12, lines 6-15.

Regarding claim 20, Faulkner further teaches the controller 16 and other limitations of the claim in col.9, lines 25-64...

13. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faulkner et al. (US. Pat. #: US 6,385,297) in view of Posthuma (US. Pat. #: 6,456,694) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Charland (US. Pat. #: 5,550,894).

Regarding claim 17, Faulkner and Posthuma '694, in combination, teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for the feature of electrically connecting said terminal of a measurement unit comprising short-circuiting between said devices. However, Charland teaches a measurement device as shown figure 2 comprising a plurality of switches wherein a switch 42 is configured as a short switch connected across the tip and ring conductor of the telephone (see col.9, lines 35-36) for a purpose of testing the subscriber line for a short circuit.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of electrically connecting said terminal of a measurement unit comprising short-circuiting between said device, as taught by Charland, into view of Faulkner and Posthuma in order to testing the subscriber line for a short circuit.

14. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faulkner et al. (US. Pat. #: US 6,385,297) in view of Posthuma (US. Pat. #: 6,456,694) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Posthuma (US. Pat. #: 6,496,566).

Regarding claim 21, Faulkner and Posthuma '694, in combination, teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for the feature of said configuration unit comprising a splitter, said splitter is able to prevent signals having a frequency below a predetermined threshold to be transmitted from said measurement unit to said selected telephone line. However, Posthuma '566 teaches a splitter, such as splitter 24 shown in

figure 1, see col.1, line 57 through col.2, line 2 for a purpose of filtering unwanted characteristics fro the subscriber loops.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of said configuration unit comprising a splitter, said splitter is able to prevent signals having a frequency below a predetermined threshold to be transmitted from said measurement unit to said selected telephone line, as taught by Posthuma '566, into view of Faulkner and Posthuma '694 in order to filter unwanted characteristics fro the subscriber loops.

15. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faulkner et al. (US. Pat. #: US 6,385,297) in view of Posthuma (US. Pat. #: 6,456,694) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Mohajeri et al. (US. Pat. #: 6,850,618 ***also cited in the previous Office Action***)

Regarding claim 22, Faulkner and Posthuma '694, in combination, teaches subject matters above, except for the feature of said splitter being able to provide substantially low impedance emulating a short-circuit between said first wire and second wire at frequencies above said predetermined threshold. However, Mohajeri et al. ("Mohajeri") teaches such features in col.2, line 59 through 3, line 9 for a purpose of testing subscriber telephone lines for either short circuit or open circuit.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of a splitter being able to provide substantially low impedance emulating a short-circuit between said first wire

and second wire at frequencies above said predetermined threshold, as taught by Mohajeri, into view of Faulkner and Posthuma '694 in order to test subscriber telephone lines for either short circuit or open circuit.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 08/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A/. In response to the Applicant arguments on page 8, wherein the applicant's repeated argued that the Faulkner and Posthuma '566, in combination or alone, fails to teach the feature of "said telephone line interconnects a telephone card with a subscriber" as recited in claim 1, and "without disconnecting said active telephone line from their respective telephone line cards."

In the independent claim 1, it recited the limitations as followings:

> "...***electrically connecting a first terminal of a measurement device to both wires of twisted wire pair of a telephone line, said telephone line interconnected a telephone line card with a subscriber***..."

In the Faulkner reference, it teaches in column 6, line 55-57 and 63-66 as followings:

> "...***Here, the measurement unit 18 contains a signal source 30, here a voltage source which is adapted to have***...," and
> "...***More particular, the voltage source has one terminal reference to ground potential and the other terminal connected in common to the pair of wires T, R, here through the resistors R1 and R2, respectively***..."

In the Posthuma '566, it reaches in column 2, lines 44-47 as followings:

> "...***a voice line card in the voice switch has a connection to a first metallic test bus connected to the voice switch metallic test unit via a first set of relays configured to connect the metallic test bus to the subscriber loop***..."

It is very clear to understand that Faulkner teaches the measurement unit 18 contains the voltage source 30 having "... ***the other terminal connected in common to the pair of wires T, R, here through the resistors R1 and R2...***" read on the limitations of "...***electrically connecting a first terminal of a measurement device to both wires of twisted wire pair of a telephone line...,***" and Posthuma '556 teaches "...***a voice line card in the voice switch ... to connect the metallic test bus to the subscriber loop...***" read on the limitations of "...***said telephone line interconnected a telephone line card with a subscriber***..."

Claim 1 only recited the limitations of connection of said telephone line to a telephone card." The claim 1 did ***not*** recite or limit such as "said telephone line interconnected to said telephone card ***under test***, ***in a test mode***, or ***during performance of a test***, etc." Therefore, the teaching of Postthuma in above column and lines read the limitations recited in claim 1. In regarding claim 7, since claim 7 was amended, see the new ground of the rejection above in this Office Action.

B/. In response to the Applicant argued on page 9 and in first paragraph on page 10 wherein the Applicant interpreted the terminals of voltmeters 22 and 24 connected to various points or nodes in figure 2. Then the Applicant concluded in the first paragraph, page 10 as followings:

> "***Accordingly, Faulkner does not teach or discloses "electrically connecting a first terminal of a measurement device to both wires of a twisted pair of a telephone line", as recited by claim 1***."

As discussed above, claim 1 simply recited a connection of a terminal of measurement device to both (tip and ring) wires of a telephone line. Claim 1 does not specifically recite any function of the terminal of measurement device, for example, feeding test signals to the line, measuring characteristics of the line, providing voltage to the line, etc. Faulkner teaches the measurement unit 18, as shown in figure 2, comprises different terminals, i.e., terminals of voltmeters, terminals of the voltage source 30, etc. Specifically, Faulkner teaches the "***voltage source has one terminal reference to ground potential and the other terminal connected in common to the pair of wires T, R, here through the resistors R1 and R2, respectively..."*** which perfectly read on the limitations of ***"electrically connecting a first terminal of a measurement device to both wires of a twisted pair of a telephone line."***

C/. In response to the Applicant's argument in the bottom paragraphs, page 11 wherein the Applicant stated as followings:

> "...***Further Applicant respectfully submits that even if the combination was proper, neither Faulkner nor Posthuma '694, alone or in combination, teaches or suggest at least "a configuration unit coupled to said line selector unit and to said line status detector and able to electrically connect a first terminal of a measurement device to both wires of a twisted wire pair of a selected telephone line and a second terminal of said measurement device to a common reference when said selected telephone line is identified as an active telephone line", as recited by claim 16***..."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's argument above. In the Office Action, page 7, the Examiner ***only*** cited the teaching of a ***line status detector*** in the Posthuma '694 in order to cure the deficiency in Faulkner reference. In the Office Action, page 7. Applicant should consider combination of teachings of Faulkner and Posthuma '694 references to meet the limitations of claim 16. Applicant should also see the responses in A/. and B/. sections as stated above. Therefore, the Applicant's argument is not specific to the teaching of line status detector in the Posthuma '694.

With all remarks to the Applicant's arguments above, Examiner has maintained the rejections of original claims 1-6 and 16-22, new ground rejection of amended independent claim 7 and its original dependent claim 8-15. Examiner has believed that the interpretations and remarks, as discussed above, the rejection in the previous Office Action as well as in the Office Action have been proper and permissible on the merits.

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claim 7 and its independent claims 8-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as stated above.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:
Box AF
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231
Or faxed to:
(703) 872-9314 or (571) 273-8300 (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")
Or:
If it is an informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")
Hand Carry Deliveries to:
Customer Service Window
(Randolph Building)
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binh K. Tieu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7510 and E-mail address: BINH.TIEU@USPTO.GOV.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (571) 272-7499 and **IF PAPER HAS BEEN MISSED FROM THIS OFFICIAL ACTION PACKAGE, PLEASE CALL CUSTOMER SERVICE FOR THE SUBSTITUTIONS OR COPIES**.

In formation regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (FAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the FAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/BINH K. TIEU/
Primary Examiner
Technology Division 2614

Date: October 2008